

DISPATCH		CLASSIFICATION S-E-C-R-E-T	DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NO. EWY 8776
TO INFO	Chief of Base, Frankfurt Chief of Station, Germany	HEADQUARTERS FILE NO. 75-6-65/1 CS COPY	
FROM	Chief, SR	DATE 21 MAY 1959	
SUBJECT	MURKWOOD Baltic Project Administration - FY 1959 Obligations	RE: "43-3" — (CHECK "X" ONE)	<input type="checkbox"/> MARKED FOR INDEXING
ACTION REQUIRED	For information.	DECLASSIFICATION AND USEAGE BY CENTRAL IBM PUBLISHING DESK ONLY	
REFERENCE(S)	A. EWY 1361, 13 March 1959 B. EWY 8776, 5 February 1959	SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2007	
<p>1. We appreciate your comments on the knotty problem of the management of the Baltic MI projects. It is a complicated situation and we are not at all sure that we have hit upon the best solution to the problem. However, before replying to Reference A, we would like to set the record straight on two matters. First, Reference A implies that the approach to project management outlined in Reference B is applicable to all SR Division projects. In fact, the proposals set forth in Reference B apply only to those Baltic projects which are the responsibility of Frankfurt Operations Base. Reference B was not meant to nor should it be construed to apply to any other projects or programs besides the ones specifically mentioned. In the same way the discussions in this dispatch will apply only to Baltic MI projects run by FOB.</p> <p>2. Second, paragraph 3 of Reference A is correct in pointing out a contradiction. However, at the time that Reference B was written, Project ACCOUNTS had not yet been finally approved. When a functional project exists, it should be changed.</p> <p>3. The scheme of Baltic project management, on which the proposals in Reference B are based, was worked out by the Division with the responsible branch of the senior staff. We believed such a scheme was necessary because the Baltic MI's, such as ██████████, ██████████/1, ██████████/2, etc., were engaged in many activities besides Baltic operations. It had become more and more difficult to justify fairly large costs by Baltic MURKWOOD operations when few results were apparent. We know that FOB thought very highly of some of these agents, and so we examined the available evidence to reconcile this discrepancy. The answer appears to lie in the fact that the agents were working in many other activities. The obvious solution is to consider the agents as FOB assets and to pay their maintenance expenses through support projects. In cases where the agent is spending more time on MI activity, we believe that the project should be turned over to that division. In regard to paragraph 2 of Reference A, we have tried to narrow the purpose of the Baltic projects to include little more than supporting expenses. We feel that in this way we will be able to evaluate more realistically the complete effectiveness of a given Baltic principal agent.</p> <p>4. Reference A indicates that there will be large increases in the expenditure of 200/000 when all the new Baltic projects are prepared. If the increase is too great, it may indicate that there is too much activity still in the developmental stage and that it might be worthwhile to review each developmental activity with a view to dropping the marginal and converting the productive into regularized projects. If, for example, there is enough continuing bona fide Baltic MURKWOOD activity you may wish to prepare a field project outline for a Baltic MURKWOOD project. If this could also result in a thorough evaluation of the potential in West Germany for Baltic MURKWOOD operations, we would all gain thereby.</p> <p>7 May 1959</p> <p>Distribution: 2 - COB, Frankfurt 2 - COB, Germany 2 - SR/2 1 - RI 1 - 74-6-303/1 SR/2/Baltic:JE/dlg</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>21 May 59</i> 74-6-65/1 CS COPY</p>			
FORM 10-57 (40) 53	USE PREVIOUS EDITION. REPLACES FORMS 51-28, 51-28A AND 51-29 WHICH ARE OBSOLETE.	CLASSIFICATION S-E-C-R-E-T	PAGE NO.
		<input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUED	